

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION**

KING SOLOMON SEALS-SUPALUS,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No. 4:24-cv-01438-NCC
)	
EVERY INDIVIDUAL & OFFICIAL)	
WITHIN THE WHOLE STATE OF)	
MISSOURI,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

OPINION, MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court on self-represented plaintiff King Solomon Seals-Supalus's application to proceed in the district court without prepaying fees or costs. Having reviewed the application and financial information, the Court will grant it and waive the filing fee. Furthermore, after initial review, the Court will dismiss this action.

Legal Standard on Initial Review

Complaints filed in forma pauperis by a non-prisoner are subject to pre-service review pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). *See Carter v. Schafer*, 273 Fed. Appx. 581 (8th Cir. 2008) (stating that “contrary to plaintiffs’ arguments on appeal, the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) apply to all persons proceeding IFP and are not limited to prisoner suits, and the provisions allow dismissal without service”). Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2), the Court is required to dismiss a complaint filed in forma pauperis if it is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. To state a claim, a plaintiff must demonstrate a plausible claim for relief, which is more than a “mere possibility of misconduct.” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 679 (2009). “A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” *Id.* at 678.

Determining whether a complaint states a plausible claim for relief is a context-specific task that requires the reviewing court to draw upon judicial experience and common sense. *Id.* at 679. The court must “accept as true the facts alleged, but not legal conclusions or threadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of action, supported by mere conclusory statements.” *Barton v. Taber*, 820 F.3d 958, 964 (8th Cir. 2016).

The Complaint

Plaintiff brings this civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging defendants “Every Individual and Official within the State of Missouri” are denying him his rewards. Because the complaint is difficult to discern, the Court will quote it in full.

Islam!

1. I’ve been “denied” my awards or rewards from winning my case, *State v. Seals or Seales v. State*. In *State v. Seals (SIC)* in and outside of the parentheses means that I’m (“seeking incomprehensible compensation.”)

2. It happened in 1974, the first part of it, and the rest in 1979. I belong to my “own” original corporation, “The adept chamber of the Moorish Science Temple of America; 3rd. Heaven or Inc. and I’m the only (Moorish-American [illegible] Muslim in the whole world).” And I’m still the Great-God-of-this earthbound and universe, Allah Himself peace.

ECF No. 1 at 3.

For relief, plaintiff seeks “\$700,707,700 zillion dollars and all wealth, gold, silver and commerce from every Missourian that’s here in Missouri 50 years in mental hospitals all over Missouri for ‘interfering with my Devine Movement.’” *Id.* at 5.

Discussion

Based on the complaint, the Court finds plaintiff’s claims lack an arguable basis in either law or fact, and are frivolous. Any legal theories are indisputably meritless and the factual allegations are “fanciful,” “fantastic,” and “delusional.” *See Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 32-33 (1992) (quoting *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319 (1989)). Thus, the Court finds that plaintiff’s complaint is frivolous and fails to state viable legal claims.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's application to proceed in the district court without prepaying fees and costs is **GRANTED**. [ECF No. 2]

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff's claims against defendants "Every Individual & Official Within the Whole State of Missouri" are **DISMISSED without prejudice**.

An Order of Dismissal will accompany this Opinion, Memorandum and Order.

Dated this 20th day of November, 2024.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Henry Edward Autrey", is positioned above a horizontal line. The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

HENRY EDWARD AUTREY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE